DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 228 CE 032 225

AUTHOR DeLong, Thomas J.
TITLE The Career Orientations Inventory: Assessing the Career Needs and Values of Educators.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Development; Career Education; *Career Planning; *Decision Making; Goal Orientation; *Individual Needs; *Self Concept; Talent; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Career Anchors Model; *Career Orientations Inventory

ABSTRACT

The career anchor model describes one's self-perceived needs, values, and talents and has the potential to serve as an information base for individuals contemplating a career change or for organizations seeking to aid individuals in career planning. Five career anchors or central areas are seen as guiding individuals' career decisions: security, technical/functional competence, managerial competence, creativity, and autonomy. Less common career variables are identity, service, and variety. A questionnaire using four-point Likert-type scale items has been developed to measure the career anchors and variables. Analysis of data from a study using the questionnaire determined that the instrument did not collect information regarding self-perceived talents of the respondents. It more accurately measured career orientations--career attitudes, values, and needs. The career anchor is therefore a composite of one's career orientations and self-perceived talents. Identifying one's career anchor can be accomplished through use of the Career Orientations Inventory along with an interviewing or self-diagnostic process. Human resource planning must take into account an individual's career anchor and provide for encouragement of career decision making. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215228

THE CAREER ORIENTATIONS INVENTORY: ASSESSING THE CAREER NEEDS AND VALUES OF EDUCATORS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas J. DeLong

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Thomas J. DeLong
P.O. Box 11 MCKB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602

CE032225

THE CAREER ORIENTATIONS INVENTORY: ASSESSING THE CAREER NEEDS AND VALUES OF EDUCATORS

Introduction

In 1975 Ed Schein of MIT introduced the concept of career anchors (Schein, 1975). Schein (1978) emphasized the need to create a model that would describe an individual's career self-concept and also reflect how values either determine or become determined by career experiences. In the past five years the career anchor model has drawn considerable attention from researchers and industrial organizations as well. Since 1978 this investigator has, through an iterative process with Schein, attempted to validate and refine how Schein's career anchor model is defined. This validation process of the career anchor model attempts to measure the career anchor through the use of a questionnaire. Although Schein used an in-depth interview approach to collect his original data, the questionnaire (Career Orientations Inventory) measured values, attitudes, and career needs, not self-perceived talents.

This paper thus reviews and refines the definition of the career anchor model, introduces other possible career anchors, introduces an instrument for use in determining one's career orientation, explains how the concept of an individual's career orientation fits into the large definition of the career anchor concept, and finally discusses the implications for educators.

As more and more individuals change employment throughout their career and ask salient career related questions, organizations and individuals must become more aware of individual needs as well as organizational needs. Perhaps the midlife crises occurs because individuals perceive their career anchors to be in one specific area, whereas the organization has very different perceptions and expections of the individual. Individuals as

well as organizations would do well to learn more about why individuals make the career decisions they do.

The career anchor model appears to have the potential to serve as a useful information base for either individuals contemplating a career change or for organizations seeking to aid individuals in career planning.

Defining the Career Anchor

The career anchor is by definition a combination of one's self-perceived needs, values, and talents. It is a self-concept, and not necessarily the actual needs, drives, or talents of the individual as they might be evident in some other process, e.g., interviews or career assessment centers. The reason the career anchor concept is a powerful concept is that it is the self-perceptions that guide and constrain the future career decisions of individuals, no matter how accurate those self-perceptions are.

As one's career evolves, the individual gradually forms a "career anchor," which begins to stabilize and guide one's career. Schein (1981, p. 1) suggests that as people move into their careers, they gradually develop a clearer self-concept in terms of their

1. Abilities and Talents: what they are good at and what they are not good at.
2. Motives and Needs: what they ultimately seek in their career (e.g., good income, security, interesting work, etc.)
3. Values: what kind of company, work environment, product or service they want to be associated with.

As people gain more information about themselves in relation to their values, needs, and self-perceived talents, an occupational self-concept emerges. Often the information collected from one's working environment

is not pleasant because it is different than one expects. For example, if a person has always wanted to work for a large organization yet finds the reality of the organization to be too restrictive, then problems may exist. The real work place is where a person's anchor actually manifests itself. That is why the first three to five years are so crucial to one's career plans. Only through actual work experience can one collect the information necessary to determine the actual career anchor. Therefore, it may be healthy for people to change careers or vocations in order to find an appropriate match between individual needs, values and self-perceived talents, and an organization.

The early career may be a time for mutual discovery between the new employee and the organization: how one fits into the organization, contributes to the organization, meets one's needs through the organization, and interacts with and receives feedback from the organization.

In Schein's initial longitudinal study, completed in 1974, there emerged clear patterns in the responses of those he interviewed; the actual job histories of the 44 alumni differed, but the consistency in the reasons given for the career decisions was great.

Five career anchors or central areas emerged that guide individuals' career decisions:

Anchor 1: SECURITY. Individuals with security as their anchor tie their careers to a particular organization. Certain people are clearly interested in creating a predictable future. Schein (1981) emphasizes that for some people security and stability become all-consuming, vis-a-vis all career decisions. The implications are that individuals who are security-oriented will also accept, to a greater degree than the other career anchor types, an organizational definition of their careers. This individual is concerned with long-term stability, benefits and basic

stability. Our research indicates that two kinds of people seek out security oriented careers. The organization man as defined by Whyte (1956) typifies people who are security-oriented, for in order to remain in the organization, individuals must socialize themselves to its values and norms. The other security orientation has roots in a particular geographical location. Often the geographically oriented person will move from company to company to insure permanence in a geographic area. Many security oriented individuals also emphasize the need to spend considerable time with the family. Often this person will sacrifice advancement for the opportunity to work a set number of hours with little overtime.

It also seems as though once an individual recognizes that his/her career anchor is security, the person may take a defensive posture. Security in our society tends to carry a negative connotation in our culture. This attitude may be due to the managerially oriented person who may judge those individuals harshly who make different career decisions and choose not to climb the hierarchy of an organization.

Anchor 2: TECHNICAL/FUNCTIONAL COMPETENCE. Technical/functional people are motivated by the challenge of the actual work they do (e.g., financial analysis, marketing, systems analysis, corporate planning.) Their anchor is the technical field, functional area, or content of their work, not the managerial process itself. The self-image of this group is tied up with feelings of competence in the particular area the groups are in.

There is a tendency to move up the hierarchy those who have a specific expertise so that they can influence others. However, experts may find the process of supervising to be frustrating at best.

Another facet of technically/functionally oriented individuals is the idea that the longer they are in a specific area of expertise the more founded their self-image becomes in their ability to do well in their

specific task. These people want to be recognized by their talents. However, many organizations find it difficult to provide challenges for this particular person. Thus the technically oriented person may switch jobs often, searching for the right mix between job challenge and recognition.

Anchor 3: MANAGERIAL COMPETENCE. The fundamental basis of the managerial competence anchor is competence in the complex activities that compose the idea of "management." Managerial competence-oriented individuals perceive that their competencies lie in the ability to analyze problems and to remain emotionally stable and interpersonally competent. Their career experiences enable them to develop the self-image that they possess the skills and values necessary to rise to general management levels. For this group of individuals, it is the opportunity to lead others that interests them. They want to be advanced quickly up the organizational hierarchy. The possibility of making large sums of money while influencing others is important to the managerially oriented person. Schein (1981, pp. 16-18) suggests three central criteria that comprise this management function:

1. Analytical competence: the ability to identify, analyze, and solve problems in situations of incomplete information and uncertainty.

2. Interpersonal and inter-group competence: the ability to influence, supervise, lead, manipulate, and control people at all levels of the organization toward organizational goal achievement.

3. Emotional competence: the capacity to be stimulated by emotional and interpersonal issues and crises rather than be exhausted or debilitated by them; the capacity to bear high levels of responsibility without becoming paralyzed; and the ability to exercise power and make difficult decisions without guilt or shame.

The general manager combines these three criteria to influence the organization. This person also becomes energized by the processes involved

in making decisions that influence others.

Anchor 4: CREATIVITY. Creative-anchored individuals have a need to create something on their own. For example, creating is the fundamental need that operates in the entrepreneur. Creative-oriented individuals seek new ventures and try their hand at new kinds of projects. They are also very central and visible while working on projects.

Some people want to create a new business or organization around a product or service in which they have a great investment. Entrepreneurs have a great need to show others that they have accomplished something for which they can take primary credit. These people may spend the early years of their careers within an organization, then typically break out on their own.

Of the people we have studied, fewest fit this description. It is also rather obvious that creative oriented persons may have problems within the large organization, unless they are given great freedom.

Anchor 5: AUTONOMY. The autonomy anchor encompasses those who have found organizational life too restrictive. They are primarily concerned about their own sense of freedom and autonomy. Autonomy-oriented individuals seek work situations in which they will be maximally free of constraint to pursue their professional or technical/functional competence. However, many organizations and job descriptions do give many degrees of freedom within the organization itself. Also, general management consists of various tasks that allow an individual to function within the structure of the organization and also have the autonomy to meet individual needs.

A number of teachers interviewed about career decisions felt that teaching gave them the autonomy to be their own boss and make their own decisions with relative freedom. The teachers also emphasized how they valued the summer to pursue their own interests. The autonomy oriented individuals typically have their own sets of standards by which to measure

their work.

Although other career anchors may exist, Schein has not to date identified them in his research. However, through lengthy discussions among faculty members at both MIT and Purdue, a list of plausible but perhaps less common career anchors was created. Three such career concepts are:

1. Identity. Individuals who are guided throughout their careers by the status and prestige of belonging to certain companies or organizations are identity-oriented. They want to be identified with a powerful or prestigious employer.

2. Service. Individuals who are service oriented are concerned with seeing people change because of their efforts. They want to use their interpersonal skills in the service of others.

3. Variety. Individuals who desire a large number of different types of challenges are variety-oriented. They seek careers that provide a maximum variety of assignments and work projects.

Questionnaire Development

A questionnaire using four-point Likert-type scale items was originally designed through an iterative process by Schein and DeLong to measure the five career anchors (security, technical/functional competence, managerial competence, creativity, and autonomy) and the three career variables (identity, service, and variety). Six items were created to collect data on each of the eight career variables. Sample items for each of the eight career variables are listed below:

1. Managerial competence: To rise to a position of leadership and influence is important to me.
2. Technical/Functional Expertise: Remaining in my specialized area as opposed to being promoted out of my area of expertise is important to me.
3. Security: An organization that will give me long term stability is important to me.
4. Autonomy: During my career I have been mainly concerned with

my own sense of freedom.

5. Creativity: To be able to build something that is entirely my own product is important to me.
6. Identity: I like to be identified with a particular organization and the prestige that accompanies that organization.
7. Variety: An endless variety of challenges in my career is important to me.
8. Service: I have always sought a career in which I could be of service to others.

Three of the six items for each variable were written to assess the degree to which the conditions described in the statement were <u>important</u> to the respondents. The response "1" indicated "of no importance", "4" indicated "centrally important."

The other three items for each variable were written to assess to what extent the conditions described in the statement were <u>true</u> for the respondents. In this case, the response "1" signified "not true" and "4" signified "completely true."

The items were assembled in two separate 24-item subinstruments according to the different response formats. The order of the anchor items in each section was determined on a random basis.

The population for this study was 1224 males who graduated between the years of 1963 and 1973 from the School of Industrial Administration at Purdue University. From the 1225 alumni, an initial sample of 600 was randomly identified from an alphabetical listing of the alumni; every other graduate on the list was selected. Of the 600 questionnaires delivered, 320 were completed and returned (55% response rate). Thirty-nine states were represented in the sample.

To estimate the reliability of the a priori dimensions within the questionnaire, a follow-up questionnaire was mailed to 100 randomly selected respondents from the 320 who completed the original questionnaire. The follow-up questionnaire contained all 48 career items from the first questionnaire, but excluded demographic data. Seventy-three of the 100

follow-up questionnaires were returned. Eight reliability coefficients were calculated, one for each career drive variable under study. A composite score for the career drive variables for both the original and follow-up questionnaires was calculated. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were competed between the original and the follow-up scores. Table 4-1 shows the test-retest reliability coefficients.

Table 4-1

Reliability coefficients computed between subscale totals for the original questionnaire and follow up questionnaire.

Career Variables	Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients
Technical competence	.71
Autonomy	.83
Service	.74
Identity	.74
Variety	.83
Managerial competence	.91
Security	.84
Creativity	.83

[a]N = 73.

Data Analysis

A factor-analytic approach was used as an internal validity check to determine whether the six items on the questionnaire measuring each career variable would cluster from the full 48 x 48 matrix. Since correlations between variables were of concern, R factoring was selected for the first factor analytic approach. In a check of the internal validity of the instrument, the factor analysis produced nine factors. The nine factors reflected the eight original variables, except that the security scale broke down into two separate scales.

Below are lists of each factor and the statements that clustered under each scale. Also included after each statement is the name of the career variable the statement attempted to describe and the factor loading for each statement.

Factor 1: Technical Competence

1. Becoming highly specialized and highly competent in some specific functional or technical area is important to me. (Technical competence = .53)
2. Remaining in my specialized area as opposed to being promoted out of my area of expertise is important to me. (Technical competence = .67)
3. Remaining in my area of expertise rather than being promoted into general management is important to me. (Technical competence = .69)
4. I will accept a management position only if it is in my area of expertise. (Technical competence = .76)
5. My main concern in life is to be competent in my area of expertise. (Technical competence = .42)
6. I see myself more as a generalist as opposed to being committed to one specific area of expertise. (Managerial competence = .45)
7. I would leave my company rather than be promoted out of my expertise. (Technical competence = .79)

Factor 2: Autonomy

1. The chance to pursue my own life-style and not be constrained by the rules of an organization is important to me. (Autonomy = .75)
2. A career that is free from organization restriction is important to me. (Autonomy = .75)
3. An endless variety of challenges in my career is important to me. (Variety = .60)
4. A career that permits a maximum of freedom and autonomy to choose my own work, hours, etc., is important to me. (Autonomy = .71)
5. I find in most organizations to be restrictive and intrusive. (Autonomy = .45)
6. During my career I have been mainly concerned with my own sense of freedom and autonomy. (Autonomy = .73)
7. I do not want to be constrained by either an organization or the business world. (Autonomy = .74)

Factor 3: Service

1. The use of my interpersonal and helping skills in the service of others is important to me. (Service = .54)
2. The process of seeing others change because of my efforts is important to me. (Service = .54)

3. Being able to use my skills and talents in the service of an important cause is important to me. (Service = .57)
4. I have always sought a career in which I could be of service to others. (Service = .80)
5. I have sought a career that allows me to meet my basic needs through helping others. (Service = .81)
6. I like to see others change because of my efforts. (Service = .50)

Factor 4: Identity

1. Being identified with a powerful or prestigious employer is important to me. (Identity = .60)
2. To be recognized by my title and status is important to me. (Identity = .70)
3. I like to be identified with a particular organization and the prestige that accompanies that organization. (Identity = .63)
4. It is important for me to be identified by my occupation. (Identity = .63)
5. I want others to identify me by my organization and my job title. (Identity = .77)

Factor 5: Variety

1. A career that gives me a great deal of flexibility is important to me. (Variety = .60)
2. A career that provides a maximum variety of types of assignments and work projects is important to me. (Variety = .72)
3. The excitement of participating in many areas of work has been the underlying motivation behind my career. (Variety = .67)
4. An endless variety of challenges is what I really want from my career. (Variety = .74)
5. I have been motivated throughout my career by using my talents in a variety of different areas of work. (Variety = .70)

Factor 6: Managerial competence

1. The process of supervising, influencing, leading, and controlling people at all levels is important to me. (Managerial competence = .74)
2. To be in a position in general management is important to me. (Managerial competence = .76)
3. To rise to a position in general management is important to me. (Managerial competence = .76)
4. I would like to reach a level of responsibility in an organization where my decisions really make a difference. (Managerial competence = .58)
5. I want to achieve a position that gives me the opportunity to combine analytical competence with supervision of people. (Managerial competence = .46)

Factor 7: Security

1. An organization that will provide security through guaranteed work, benefits, a good retirement, etc. is important to me. (Security = .82)
2. An organization that will give me long-run stability is important to me. (Security = .78)
3. I am willing to sacrifice some of my autonomy to stabilize my total life situation. (Security = .60)

Factor 8: Security

1. Remaining in my present geographical location rather than moving because of a promotion is important to me. (Security = .92)
2. It is important for me to remain in my present geographical location rather than move because of a promotion or new job assignment. (Security = .87)

Factor 9: Creativity

1. To be able to create or build something that is entirely my own product or idea is important to me. (Creativity = .64)
2. The use of my skills in building a new business enterprise is important to me. (Creativity = .54)
3. I have been motivated throughout my career by the number of products that I have been directly involved in creating. (Creativity = .65)
4. I would like to accumulate a personal fortune to prove to myself and others that I am competent. (Creativity = .38)

Of the 48 original statements describing the eight career variables, four statements did not cluster under any of the nine factors and have been discarded. More interestingly, under factor 1, six of the seven highest factor loadings were observed for items describing the career anchor "technical competence." In factor 2, five of the six highest coefficients were for "autonomy" items. In factor 3, five of the six "service" items factored together. The fifth factor correlated highly with five of the six "variety" items.

Factor 6 clustered around five of the six "managerial competence" items. Factors 7 and 8 both focused on the "security" anchor. In factor 7, high coefficients corresponded to three items emphasizing job stability, benefits, and good retirement. Factor 8, on the other hand, clustered

around the two items that focused on remaining in a certain geographical location as opposed to moving one's employment location. Factor 9 was composed of four questions describing the career variable "creativity."

Although this factor analysis distinguished nine separate factors from the data, many of the original items from different factors did not account for reasonable amounts of additional variance from the original 48 x 48 correlation matrix. Upon further investigation, Schein and the investigator determined that the questionnaire did not collect any information in relation to self-perceived talents of the respondents. The instrument more accurately measured career attitudes, values and needs of the respondents which we defined as career orientations. Thus the term career orientation evolved as a central part of the definition of career anchors. It is essential to emphasize that the career anchor is a composite of one's career orientations (needs, attitudes, and values) and self-perceived talents.

Cases of other Career Orientations

Along with the five career anchors already discussed, the three career orientations (service, identity, variety) clearly factored out as separate and distinct career orientations. The other career orientations are described in greater detail below.

Service. In using various samples in our research, it became clear that some individuals valued and made career decisions in relation to service. One middle-aged school administrator commented, "I realize that I have come up through the school district and am seen as a leader. However, what really matters to me is seeing children change and grow because of my efforts. If I couldn't serve the teachers as well as students, I would leave my job tomorrow."

Many educators verbalize their need to serve other people in a helping fashion. When asked what anchor they were least willing to give up, many educators said "service." Interestingly, few MBA's expressed a concern for serving as a driving force in career decision making.

It is clear that those people turning to the helping professions develop their self-image through their interaction with others. One teacher who was trained in special education stated, "My love for this job comes not from my colleagues but from my students. I get concerned also that if I do my job too well, they may make me an administrator. All I want to do is help these kids learn to read and manage their lives better."

It is also obvious that not all those categorized a having jobs in a helping profession are security oriented. A clinical psychologist may value assisting others; however, he/she may also find the autonomy that exists in being on a faculty, having a private practice, etc., to be more central to the career decision-making process. Another psychologist may also value having a particular expertise within his/her field, e.g., using behavior modification, using hypnosis to treat weight loss, etc. Thus, within a particular job, title, or job classification all the anchors may exist.

Variety. Some people have mentioned throughout their interviews that they need variety in their work. A sense of urgency to change jobs frequently or tasks within a particular job was an implicit need. In the research that focused on MBA alumni, a number of graduates believed they selected general management because they would be allowed to do many things. One alumnus commented, "I specifically went into general management so that I could perform many functions within the organization. I have always become bored easily, and I knew I had to find a career that would allow me a lot of variety. Whenever I find myself doing one particular job too

long, I get nervous and my productivity declines. I never want to get caught in a situation where I perform only one function."

When originally determining whether other career anchors existed, the investigator assumed there would be little difference between autonomy and variety. However, further investigation suggested that many people saw the autonomy and variety very differently. Autonomy suggests more the need for an individual to be his/her own boss, while variety focuses more on the need for an individual to have an array of work responsibilities.

A number of school teachers were emphatic that variety was their central career self-image. One veteran teacher explained, "To be able to teach four different subjects throughout the day, plus in the summer vacation to work different jobs--I just couldn't ask for a better job. I also get bored working with the same people over and over again. These kids are all different and so energetic. The combination of kids, subject matter and time from school makes this a great deal for me."

Identity. A few individuals expressed a need to be identified with a large or prestigious organization. The central drive seemed to be status. Although identity may also be a concept under the rubric of management, a few people believed that identity played the central role in shaping their occupational self-concept. One manager stated, "The organization for which I work is known throughout the world. People are impressed when I tell them who I work for. I will never leave this organization for anything."

Other career orientations may surface as research continues on the career anchor concept. Derr (1981) suggests another anchor, the "warrior." This career concept is a combination of technical competence and autonomy. An example of the "warrior" is the "fighter pilot" who thrives on putting his life on the line. Others suggest the power and influence may be an anchor worthy of further investigation. However, needs for variety,

identity, service, power and influence may also fit under other anchors, especially the managerial anchor (Schein, 1981).

Security. It seemed logical that identity (identifying with an organization or employer) and "security" (concern for geographical location benefits and long-term stability) would factor together because of an underlying assumption in both variables of an acceptance for organizational norms. However, all of the factor analyses run depicted a strong separation in the definition of the career anchor security. In the original factor analysis, statements that defined security in relation to long-term stability factored under one specific factor. The correlation coefficients of the next factor correlated with the "security" statements that focused on geographical location as a dimension of security. The more we identified this difference, the more people in interviews also stated that they see security from these two perspectives. One MBA alumnus stated, "I am interested in remaining where I presently work. The location is ideal for my family and myself. If the organization for which I worked wanted to transfer me, I would probably leave the company. This geographical area simply means too much to me."

"Security" as a career value seemed to play a major role in the career decision making processes of many educators. Many educators either realized their need to remain in a particular geographical location or to retain long term benefits. One teacher explained, "Where else can I work nine months a year and get a paycheck plus benefits throughout the summer. It is an ideal situation for a farmer like me who needs some security to outweigh the inconsistency in farming."

When the MBA's were originally studied in 1979, it looked as though there was a rather obvious dichotomy--security on one end of the continum

and autonomy on the other. However, in separating security by definition into two components, it is possible for someone to value autonomy and security. An illustration follows.

An MBA graduate from Purdue had worked for a large multinational corporation for two years. He did not like the impersonal feeling of his department or organization. He eventually quit the company but wanted to stay in the general geographical location. The graduate stated, "I simply needed more freedom than the larger organization allowed. I wanted more say in my own job description. In fact, I would really like to be my own boss. I guess the two most important criteria that control my career decision-making are the need to be autonomous and also to live in this area of the country.

The more we study the career concept of "security," the more our research suggests how different people see and define security. Clearly, geographical location and stability are two important terms in the definition of security as an anchor.

Discussion

It is worth noting that two very different approaches in evaluating the career anchor model produced two different outcomes. Schein's development of the career anchor model was based on interview data. With the exception of Schein's biographical form, Schein's subsequent studies were also based on interview data. This study was the first to evaluate the career anchor model through a more empirical approach. The Career Orientations Inventory was used to measure data on the values and needs of various respondents. The questionnaire did not collect data centered around the respondents' self-perceived talents. Schein (1978) suggests that the individual undergoes a number of experiences that define for both

the individual and the organization the employee's area of talents. Through more and more job experiences, both the individual and organization gain new insights about each other. The more information collected, the more accurate the perceptions to career decisions become. Thus, the instrument used in this study may be a rather accurate measure of career orientations rather than Schein's career anchor model. Thus, through the use of the Career Orientations Inventory, along with an interviewing process, a career anchor can be identified. Schein suggests that individuals can identify their own career anchor by using a self diagnostic package.[1] In any event, the statistical results do indicate that the questionnaire identifies rather accurately specific career orientations.

Identifying one's career anchor through a self-diagnostic process strengthens the individual's ability to make more informed career choices. The individual who experiences organizational pressures to accept promotion yet wants to remain in his/her specialty may find the identification of the career anchor useful in understanding his/her own career decisions. Further, a particular job may change, yet the career anchor may not change at all.

The typology of career anchors and career orientations plays a more significant role as organizations begin to focus on human resource planning and development. Neither individual satisfaction nor organizational effectiveness can be achieved if a strategy does not exist to meet these needs. An organization that focuses on human resource planning must not only be concerned with organization effectiveness, but also with individual effectiveness (Schein, 1978).

---

[1]Schein has created a self diagnostic package which includes the Career Orientations Inventory and interview data.

In relation to career planning, Schein suggests the following

> The dynamics of the matching process between individual and organization cannot be managed without more knowledge about: (a) individual life cycles and how self, career, and family development interact throughout those cycles; (b) the nature of organizational career dynamics, career paths, career stages, and other aspects of how organizations recruit, utilize, and manage their human resources; (c) the reciprocal interaction of individual and organization, the process of organizational socialization, and the process of individual innovation. (p. 244)

One phase of individual innovation is understanding models of career planning. The dynamics of finding one's career orientation and subsequently finding a sufficient range of job challenges to determine one's anchor is crucial. Without insight into one's own career anchor, the problems of mid and late career are much more likely to be severe. If human resource planning is to be viewed as a total systems approach, both the organization and individual must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the ongoing system.

One of the central issues is whether educational organizations have enough flexibility to meet the needs of individuals who have many different and varying career anchors. The typology of career anchors plays a significant role as organizations begin to focus on human resources planning and development. Neither individual satisfaction nor organizational effectiveness can be achieved if a strategy does not exist to meet those needs.

One phase of individual innovation is understanding models of career development. The dynamics of finding one's career orientation and finding a sufficient range of job challenges to determine one's orientation is crucial. Without insight into one's own career orientation the problems of mid and late career are much more likely to be severe. If human resource planning is to be viewed as a total systems approach, then both the organization and individual must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the ongoing system.

Those involved with human resource planning may also want to know more about midlife and career dimensions. Training and development functions within organizations need relevant models to guide and encourage employees to make the time of career decision making a productive time for both the organization and the individual. Since the organization is a more complex system, one must consider how each sub-system can be managed toward optimum effectiveness. Greater understanding of the human element is only one facet or the organizational system, yet a most crucial one (DeLong, 1977). Schein's career anchor model and the rather new typology of career orientations (managerial, technical, autonomy, creativity, and security, variety, identity, and service) may provide additional structure to our understanding of the human element.

References

Bailyn, L., and Schein, E. H. "Life/career considerations as indicators of quality of employment." In A. A. Biderman and T. F. Drury, eds. Measuring Work Quality for Social Reporting. New York: Sage Publications, 1976.

Bischof, L. Adult Psychology. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Derr, B. "Living on adrenaline -- the adventurer/entrepreneur." working paper, University of Utah, 1982.

DeLong, T. J. "The career orientations of MBA alumni: a multidimensional model" in New Directions in Human Resource Management. (Ralph Katz, ed.) MIT Press, January, 1982.

DeLong, T. J. "What do middle managers really want from firstline supervisors?" Supervisory Management (AMACOM). September, 1977. No. 9.

Driver, M. "The career revolution in aerospace engineering." Unpublished paper delivered at Annual Conference of Allied Weight Engineers. Philadelphia, 1976.

Ginsberg, E., Ginsburg, S., Axelrad, S., and Herna, J. Occupational Choice: An Approach to a General Theory. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Gould, R., Transformations. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Hall, D. T. Careers in Organizations. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1976.

Hall, G. and Thomas F. J. "The impact of career anchors on the organizational development of program managers in the aerospace industry." Unpublished Master's thesis. Sloan School of Management, MIT, 1979.

Kalish, R. A. Late Adulthood: Perspectives on Aging. Monterey, California: Brooks-Cole, 1975.

Kimmel, D. C. Adulthood and Aging: An Introductory Development View. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. M., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., and McKee, B. "The psycho-social development of men in early adulthood and the mid-life transition." In D. F. Richs, A. Thomas, and M. Roof, eds., Life History Research in Psychopathology, Vol. 3. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1974.

McClelland, D. C., and Steele, R. S. "Two faces of power." In Human Motivation: A Book of Readings. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1973b, pp. 300-315.

Schein, E. H. Developing Your Career - Know Your Career Anchors and Develop Your Options, working paper, MIT, 1981.

Schein, E. H. Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Schein, E. H. "How career anchors hold executives to their career paths." Personnel. May/June, 1975.

Scott, W. A. Values in Organizations. New York: Rand McNally, 1965.

Sheehy, G. Passages. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Super, D. E. and Bohn, M. J. Occupational Psychology. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1970.

Thompson, P. H., Dalton, G. W., and Price, R., "Career stages: a model of professional careers in organizations." Organizational Dynamics, Summer, 1977.

Troll, L. E. Early and Middle Adulthood. Monterey, California: Brooks-Cole, 1975.

Van Maanen, J., and Schein, E. H. "Career development." In J. R. Hackman and J. L. Suttle, eds. Improving Life at Work. Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1977.

Whyte, W. H. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.